



F

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
 Gregory J. Petras) Group Art Unit: 2167
Serial No.: 10/624,345)
Filed: 07/22/03) Examiner: Ali, Mohammad
For: System for Creating and Maintaining A)
Database of Information Utilizing User Opinions) Att'y Docket No.: WC01520-2

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

The Examiner's comments and the cited references of the Office Action mailed 05/04/05 have been carefully considered, and, responsive thereto, Applicant amends and states as follows:

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

Applicant has timely traversed the Examiner's restriction. Applicant requested that Claims 64-85 be additionally grouped together and examined with the Claims elected by the Applicant since the claim elements are so similar to the elected claims 43-63 that it would not be a burden on the Examiner. Examining claims 64-85 would *clearly* require searching the same classes and subclasses as for examination of claims 43-63. For example, if the steps of Claim 43 and the steps of Claim 64 are compared, the language of the substance of the comparable steps is similar. According to MPEP § 803, "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner **must** examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." (emphasis added) In the present case, Claims 43-63 and Claims 64-85, clearly comprise similar elements that will require searching in the same classes, and would not place undue burden on the examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not responded to Applicant's traverse of the Examiner's restriction.